The gap symmetry is marginal in high-T_c superconductivity: Isotropic s-wave pairing leads to either s or d-wave gap depending on the Coulomb pseudopotential

G. Varelogiannis
Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Piazzale Aldo Moro 2, I-00185 Roma, Italy

We point out that in two-dimensional systems like high-T_c superconductors, an isotropic s-wave electron-phonon interaction in the momentum decoupling regime leads to either s or d-wave superconductivity depending on the conventional values of the Coulomb pseudopotential. It is therefore possible that $YBa_2Cu_3O_7$ is an anisotropic d-wave and $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_8$ an anisotropic s-wave superconductor both having the same pairing interaction and similar T_c's. A transition from s-wave to d-wave superconductivity may also be possible by adjusting the doping.

arXiv:cond-mat/9511139v1 30 Nov 1995

The symmetry of the order parameter is in the center of the debate on the origin of high-T_c superconductivity [1]. It is generally believed that the symmetry of the gap should also indicate the symmetry of the pairing mechanism. Studying this symmetry should allow one to determine whether cuprates are conventional s-wave superconductors with an interaction that could be mediated by phonons, or whether they are unconventional d-wave superconductors in which case the pairing interaction should be due to spin fluctuations [2] or to some other exotic mechanism. In this spirit one expects that $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_8$ and $YBa_2Cu_3O_7$ should both have the same symmetry, and their high critical temperatures should be intimately related to the symmetry of the gap.

Qualitative aspects of anisotropy in $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_8$, like the correlation between the gap, the electronic density of states (DOS) and the visibility of the dip above the gap anisotropies [3], the strong enhancement of the anisotropy with temperature [4], the asymmetry of the SIN tunnel spectra where the dip is seen only at negative sample bias [5] and also the possible presence of a secondary gap maximum or "hump" in the $\Gamma - X$ direction [6], have been shown to indicate that the pairing interaction is isotropic s-wave in the momentum decoupling regime [7]. Momentum decoupling (MD) arises when the characteristic momenta exchanged during the pairing interaction are small compared to the characteristic momenta of the electronic density of states (DOS) variations over the Brillouin zone. In that case the Eliashberg equations in the momentum space tend to decouple and have different couplings in different regions of the Fermi surface. These couplings are proportional to the local DOS and therefore anisotropies of superconductivity reflect the DOS anisotropies. Our analysis of the $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_8$ phenomenology in this context points to an anisotropic s-wave gap [7]. However, various phase sensitive [8] and node sensitive [9] experiments on $YBa_2Cu_3O_7$ report evidence of a sign reversal of the order parameter supporting d-waves [10], although experimental contradictions persist [11,12].

We will show in this letter that, contrary to the general belief, the symmetry of the order parameter does not represents a crucial criterion for the symmetry of the pairing interaction, and is an energetically marginal parameter. We will see in particular that an isotropic s-wave interaction (that could be mediated by phonons) in the momentum decoupling regime can lead to *either* s-wave or d-wave superconductivity depending on parameters that are *marginal* for the pairing mechanism. These parameters are the magnitude of the Coulomb pseudopotential μ^* and the relative importance of the characteristic momenta of the variations of the Coulomb pseudopotential μ^* compared to the characteristic momenta exchanged during the pairing interaction. It is for example possible that $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_8$ is an anisotropic s-wave and $YBa_2Cu_3O_7$ an *anisotropic* d-wave superconductor both having *the same* attractive isotropic s-wave interaction in the momentum decoupling regime. In addition, it may be possible to switch from s-wave to d-wave superconductivity and vice versa by doping since μ^* depends sensitively on the doping. Of course it will also be clear that a d-wave gap symmetry *does not* imply a spin fluctuation pairing mechanism [2].

Energetic irrelevance of the symmetry of the order parameter has also been reported in a model proposed to describe the "spin gap" in underdoped cuprates [13]. This property is also seen in another model in which the Fermi surface is divided in three independent pieces and the interaction has a low energy cut-off [14]. The possibility that phonons may help d-wave superconductivity which is primarily due to spin fluctuations has been reported in Ref. [15], while more recently Nazarenko and Dagotto [16] proposed a specific Holstein model with nearest neighbor attraction which leads to d-wave superconductivity the spin fluctuations playing a secondary role.

The Coulomb pseudopotential μ^* represents the effective repulsion between the paired electrons [18] and is present in all conventional superconductors, acting essentially as an effective negative coupling [19] and reducing slightly the isotope effect exponent. In a two dimensional system in the MD regime μ^* becomes a crucial parameter having unexpected implications on the gap symmetry. We performed simulations on a BCS model, in which case

the gap is given by (we use the notations of [7])

$$\Delta(\vec{k}) = \sum_{\vec{p},|\xi_p|<\Omega_D} \frac{-\bar{V}(\vec{k}-\vec{p})\Delta(\vec{p})}{2\sqrt{\xi_{\vec{p}}^2+\Delta^2(\vec{p})}} \tanh\left(\sqrt{\frac{\xi_{\vec{p}}^2+\Delta^2(\vec{p})}{2T}}\right)$$

Where $\bar{V}(\vec{q}) = V^A(\vec{q}) + \mu^*(\vec{q})$ is the sum of the attractive interaction, due for example to electron-phonon coupling V^A, and the effective Coulomb repulsion μ^*. We solve this equation iteratively on a grid 120×120 in the zero temperature regime.

We consider an isotropic s-wave electron-phonon coupling having at small momenta a Lorentzian behavior as a function of the norm of the exchanged momentum $V^A(\vec{q}) = -g^2\big(1 + |\vec{q}|^2/Q_c^2(e-ph)\big)^{-1}$. In this spectrum the electron-phonon scattering is dominated by the processes which transfer a momentum smaller than $Q_c(e-ph)$. In our analysis $Q_c(e-ph)$ is the relevant parameter and the particular shape of the interaction is irrelevant. As for the repulsive interaction, we first consider the simple case of a momentum independent Coulomb pseudopotential $\mu^*(\vec{q}) = \mu_0^*$ (hard-core-like yet finite repulsion). Band structure effects are completely marginal for our discussion here, and for clarity we show results corresponding to the simple nearest neighbor tight binding dispersion at half-filling $\xi_{\vec{k}} = -2t[\cos(k_x) + \cos(k_y)]$ (the lattice spacing is taken equal to unity). All our discussion is unaltered by the inclusion of next nearest neighbor or other terms in the dispersion relation [20].

We show in figure 1 some of the calculated momentum dependent gap functions on the Fermi surface, for different values of μ_0^* in both the d-wave and s-wave channel. When k varies from 0 to π we cover a quadrant of the Fermi surface Here we take $Q_c(e-ph) \approx \pi/12$ which places us in the momentum decoupling regime and is relevant for $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_8$ [7]. The momentum dependence of the gap in the s-wave channel at zero repulsion (upper full line) is precisely due to momentum decoupling.

When we introduce repulsion in the s-wave channel, the gap is reduced by a constant amount in all directions (triple-dot-dashed line) resulting therefore in an effective enhancement of the anisotropy. At a critical value of the repulsion which in the case considered in Fig. 1 is on the order $\mu^*/g^2 \approx 0.21$ (dot-dashed line), the gap becomes almost zero in the (π,π) direction, and we have a *discontinuous* transition to a new gap symmetry structure with two nodes in the quadrant shown in Fig. 1 (dotted and dashed lines). In this new state the gap becomes *independent* on the magnitude of μ^* and the areas of the Fermi surface at which the gap is positive are equal to the areas in which the gap is negative. We will see in the following that this new state is not the physical state occupied by the system because at these μ^* the d-wave solution is energetically more favorable.

The d-wave solution is also characterized by independence of the gap on the magnitude of μ^*. The origin of the repulsion independence of the gap lies on the momentum independence of μ^*, on the equality of the Fermi surface areas with positive and negative gap, and on the two dimensional character of the system considered here. We can see this analytically by considering a circular Fermi surface. If the gap on the Fermi surface has the form $\Delta_{\vec{k}} = \Delta\cos(n\phi)$ where n is the number of nodes and ϕ is the polar angle in the usual polar coordinates, then the momentum independent repulsive contribution to the gap function becomes proportional to the integral [17]

$$I = \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \frac{\Delta\cos(n\phi)}{\sqrt{\xi_{|\vec{k}|}^2 + \Delta^2\cos^2(n\phi)}} = 0$$

which is *identically* zero. Therefore a gap changing sign periodically on a two dimensional system eliminates the effect of any *momentum independent* repulsion.

We obtain in this way a qualitative understanding of the discontinuous nature of the transition in the s-wave channel in Fig. 1 (from dot-dashed live at $\mu^*/g^2 = 0.21$ to dashed line at $\mu^*/g^2 = 0.22$). We also remark on the following points that might generally apply to any two-dimensional system: First, it is impossible to get a zero gap somewhere on the Fermi surface without a variation of sign of the order parameter. Secondly, the system can only have nodes with a finite slope and therefore if there are nodes a linear T-dependence of the penetration depth at low temperatures is plausible [9]. Finally, when the gap changes sign, the area of the Fermi surface in which it is positive is equal to the area in which it is negative.

In realistic situations μ^* is momentum dependent (the repulsion is not hard-core-like) To introduce a smooth momentum cut-off for the variations of μ^* we consider a structure analogous to that of the pairing interaction written at small q as $\mu^*(\vec{q}) = \mu_0^*\big(1 + |\vec{q}|^2/Q_c^2(Cb)\big)^{-1}$, in which case $Q_c(Cb)$ represents the characteristic range of the exchanged momenta (smooth cut-off) in the repulsive interaction. We considered various different momentum structures of μ^* and we checked that the following discussion remains valid with only slight quantitative modifications [20]. The important parameter is the momentum cut-off in the repulsive interaction $Q_c(Cb)$ compared to that in the attractive pairing interaction $Q_c(e-ph)$. We show in Fig. 2 the s-wave and d-wave gap solutions for $Q_c(Cb) = \pi/4$ and $Q_c(e-ph) = \pi/12$. Now the d-wave solution is not repulsion independent but it still appears less sensitive to the repulsion than the s-wave solution. It is clear from Fig. 2 (and also Fig. 1) that at some critical repulsion the absolute d-wave gap will become larger in average than the s-wave gap, and this will become the energetically favorable state.

To find out which of the s-wave and d-wave solutions is the physical state of the system, one has to calculate the free energy gain due to the superconducting transition

[21], the physical solution being that with the higher absolute free energy gain (the lower free energy). Of course the solution with the higher free energy gain is that for which the integral of the absolute value of the gap on the Fermi surface is higher and this is also the solution with the higher T_c. In figure 3 we show the evolution of the free energy gain (absolute value of the free energy due to the superconducting transition in arbitrary units) as a function of μ_0^*/g^2 in the case $Q_c(Cb) = \pi/4$ and $Q_c(e-ph) = \pi/12$. The s-wave solution is favorable when μ_0^*/g^2 is small but when this ratio takes values larger than a critical value of the order of $\mu_0^*/g^2 \approx 0.15$ then the d-wave solution becomes more favorable. If we were able to control μ^* for example by doping then we could induce transitions from s-wave to d-wave superconductivity and vice versa.

Notice that such s-d transitions occur in our system at conventional values of the Coulomb pseudopotential already seen in low-T_c superconductors [18]. The critical μ_0^* is very dependent on the ratio $Q_c(e-ph)/Q_c(Cb)$, We studied the evolution of the free energy gain in the s and d-wave channels as a function of μ_0^*/g^2 for different values of $Q_c(e-ph)/Q_c(Cb)$. This allowed us to construct the phase diagram shown in Figure 4. We also made an analogous study in the case of different momentum structures of μ^* having an effective momentum cut-off and the resulting phase diagrams are similar to that of Fig. 4 [20]. When for a given $Q_c(e-ph)/Q_c(Cb)$ the ratio μ^*/g^2 is larger than the critical value showed in Fig. 4, the gap is d-wave. It is clear that the smaller the ratio $Q_c(e-ph)/Q_c(Cb)$ the smaller is the value of the critical repulsion while for $Q_c(e-ph)$ of the same order as $Q_c(Cb)$ the d-wave solution is impossible and this is probably the case in low-T_c metallic superconductors. Since in the MD regime $Q_c(e-ph) \ll k_F$, we can also have $Q_c(e-ph) \ll Q_c(Cb)$, in which case s and d-wave superconductivity are energetically close and both states are physically acceptable depending on the precise value and structure of μ^*. We remark that if in our scheme we want to have both d-wave and high-T_c, then it is better to be well in the MD regime and have a small critical μ^*, since large μ^* reduces T_c. Notice that the evolution of T_c follows essentially that of the free energy gain and from figures 2 and 3 one can conclude that the negative effect of μ^* on T_c is smaller in the case of d-waves than in the case of s-waves [20].

It is important to notice that the d-wave state we obtain is anisotropic and its anisotropies are driven by the DOS anisotropies in the same way as for the s-wave state [7]. This is clear in Figures 1 and 2 where the d-wave solution away from the $(\pi/2, \pi/2)$ direction has exactly the form of the s-wave solution. When we are in the MD regime we always have different couplings in different regions of the Fermi surface whatever the symmetry of the gap and a large part of our discussion of ARPES and tunneling in $Bi_2Sr_2CaC_2O_8$ [7] remains valid even for the d-wave state. In particular all our discussion on the origin of the dip structure [22], the correlation of gap, dip and DOS anisotropies, and the asymmetry of SIN tunnel spectra [7] is also true in the MD d-wave. We remark that in the case of a d-wave state obtained by spin fluctuations it was impossible to reproduce the dip above the gap by strong coupling calculations [23].

We are grateful to Prof. L. Pietronero for stimulating discussions and encouragement.

[1] See for example: B. Goss Levi, Phys. Today **46**(5), 17 (1993)

[2] N.E. Bickers, D.J. Scalapino and S.R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 961 (1989); P. Monthoux, A. Balatsky and D. Pines, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 3348 (1991)

[3] Z.-X. Shen and D.S. Dessau, Physics Reports **253**, p. 1-162 (1995)

[4] J. Ma, C. Quitmann, R.J. Kelley, H. Berger, G. Margaritondo, and M. Onellion, Science **267**, 862 (1995)

[5] Ch. Renner and Ø. Fischer, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 9208, (1995)

[6] H. Ding et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2784 (1995)

[7] G. Varelogiannis, A. Perali, E. Cappelluti and L. Pietronero, preprint cond-mat/9507052

[8] D.A. Wollman, D.J. Van Harlingen, W.C. Lee, D.M. Ginzberg and A.J. Leggett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2134 (1993); D.A. Brawner and H.R. Ott, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 6530 (1994); C.C. Tsuei, J.R. Kirtley, C.C. Chi, L.S. Yujahnes, A. Gupta, T. Shaw, J.Z. Sun, and M.B. Ketchen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 593 (1994)

[9] W.N. Hardy, D.A. Bonn, D.C. Morgan, R. Liang and K. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 3999 (1990); L.A. de Vaulchier, J.P. Vieren, Y. Guldner, N. Bontemps, R. Combescot, Y. Lemaitre and J.C. Mage, preprint cond-mat/9504062

[10] Some models tend to describe the phase sensitive experiments in $YBa_2Cu_3O_7$ without d-waves: I.I. Mazin, A.A. Golubov and A.D. Zaikin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 2574 (1995); D.Z. Liu, K. Levin, and J. Maly, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 8680 (1995)

[11] P. Chaudhari and S.-Y. Lin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1084 (1994); A.G. Sun, D.A. Gajewski, M.B. Maple and R.C. Dynes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2267 (1994)

[12] For reviews see: R.C. Dynes, Sol. State Commun. **92**, 53 (1994); J.R. Schrieffer, Sol. State Commun. **92**, 129 (1994)

[13] B.L. Altshuler, L.B. Ioffe and A.J. Millis, To be published in Phys. Rev. B. We thank Andy Millis for bringing this reference to our attention and for a very stimulating discussion

[14] G. Santi, T. Jarlborg, M.Peter and M. Weger, J. of Supercond., **8**, 405 (1995)

[15] A.I. Lichtenstein and M.L. Kulic, Physica C **245**, 186 (1995)

[16] A. Nazarenko and E. Dagotto, preprint

cond-mat/9510030
[17] A model with a cylindrical Fermi surface is studied in: M. Peter and G. Varelogiannis, preprint
[18] P.B. Allen and B. Mitrovic, in Solid State Physics **37**, (1981); J.P. Carbotte, Rev. Mod. Phys. **62**, 1027 (1990)
[19] G. Varelogiannis, Physica C **249**, 87 (1995)
[20] A detailed analysis will be published elsewhere
[21] J. Bardeen and M. Stephen, Phys. Rev. **136**, A1485 (1964)
[22] G. Varelogiannis, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 1381 (1995)
[23] D.J. Scalapino, Private Communication, see also P. Monthoux and D.J. Scalapino, Physica B **199-200**, 294 (1994)

Figure 1: The gap as a function of k_x (or k_y) for a momentum independent repulsion μ^* and $Q_c(e-ph) = \pi/12$. We consider the s-wave channel and $\mu^* = 0$ (upper full line), $\mu^*/g^2 = 0.05$ (triple-dot-dashed line), $\mu^*/g^2 = 0.21$ (dot-dashed line), $\mu^*/g^2 = 0.22$ (dotted line), $\mu^*/g^2 = 0.30$ (dashed line) and the d-wave channel for the same μ^*/g^2 ratios (lower full line). The d-wave solution is independent of μ^*.

Figure 2: The s-wave gap (full lines) and the d-wave gap (dashed lines) as a function of k_x (or k_y) on a quadrant of the Fermi surface, for three different values of the repulsion $\mu_0^*/g^2 = 0.05$, 0.15 and 0.25, in the case $Q_c(e-ph) = \pi/12$ and $Q_c(Cb) = \pi/4$. The smaller the ratio μ_0^*/g^2 the larger is the absolute value of the gap in both the s and d-wave solutions.

Figure 3: The absolute value of the free energy gain due to the superconducting transition as a function of the ratio μ_0^*/g^2 for $Q_c(e-ph) = \pi/12$ and $Q_c(Cb) = \pi/4$. The dotted line (triangles) corresponds to the d-wave solution and the full line (circles) to the s-wave solution. The physical solution is that with the higher absolute free energy gain (lower free energy).

Figure 4: Phase diagram. The critical repulsion μ_0^*/g^2 for the transition from s-wave to d-wave superconductivity as a function of the ratio $Q_c(e-ph)/Q_c(Cb)$. The upper region of the graph corresponds to the d-wave state.